

E 458

.2

.B86

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00006144007







AN ADDRESS

BY

B. GRATZ BROWN, ESQ.

SLAVERY

In its National Aspects as related to Peace and War.

DELIVERED BEFORE THE GENERAL EMANCIPATION SOCIETY OF THE
STATE OF MISSOURI, AT ST. LOUIS,

On Wednesday Evening, September 17, 1862.

GENTLEMEN: I shall address you this evening upon the subject of "Slavery in its National Aspects, as related to Peace and War." Had circumstances made it appropriate, it would have given me pleasure to adopt a line of remark more immediately directed to the local objects of your organization. But each hour has its supreme duty, and I conceive the duty of this hour to be the strengthening the hands and upholding the heart of the National Government, that it may be induced both to feel wherein lies the peril that most besets us, and to strike at it with the death stroke.

THE CONSTITUTION—ITS ANNIVERSARY.

This day, as you know, is the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. That instrument was in itself a descent and a compromise from the elevated ground of the Declaration of Independence of 1776, not less than of the subsequent Ordinance of 1787, and unfortunately compromises have been the order of the day ever since. Nevertheless it was the work of earnest men striving to do honestly their appointed task. Let us honor them for their intent. To say that the Constitution was designed to develop into harmonious unity, and bind in perpetual league the States and peoples that were parties thereto would be only to reiterate the language employed by its framers in urging its ratification. But constitutions do not make nations, and growths are sometimes fostered, and moral influences sometimes repressed that produce strange contortions in the body politic. And so it has transpired in this instance. After three quarters of a century of operation there is witnessed division instead of union, discord instead of harmony, hate instead of love, between the jarring sections of the country. No fulsome panegyric upon by gone times—no unreasoning laudation of the constitution in itself—will either explain or remedy this unlooked for ending to so many hopes clustered around an almost deified parchment. And I do not propose to go into any such declamation; but shall leave it to those who believe nothing good but what is past, nothing possible but what is accomplished, and who stand

idle singing syren songs to obsolete forms whilst the very ground beneath their feet cracks with the tremor of the earthquake. These days are full enough of events to have their own elucidation; the Constitution in its narrow fitting is straining and rending on the athletic body of an aroused nation, claiming adjustment, not flatteries; the high noon of the civilization of the continent is come in storm and darkness, and the out-looks must be watchful, the penetration clear and deep, the sacrifices rapid, unhesitating, suited to the necessities, if we are to ride out the whorls and breakers that surround.

WE ARE THE REVOLUTION.

They who would forecast the results of the great crisis which is now upon this nation, must do so by other lights than those relied on in past partisan controversies regarding our Government and its functions. This is an age of transition, precipitated on us, it is true, by armed resistance to the national sovereignty, but none the less a transition age for all that. It is a passage from the Old to the New; abruptly, with disjointed effort, impeded by formalisms, reactions, civil war; yet, nevertheless, a veracious passage, AND WE ARE THE REVOLUTION.

The seceded States began this conflict of arms, and in so far are responsible for its many calamities; but they only cast down the barriers to the pent up thought of the nation, and in the present still more than in the past, that thought is marching on with the vast development that ever characterizes revolutionary cycles. A full conception of this truth is essential to any understanding, either of the changes that have so far passed upon rulers as well as people, or of those other and sterner attitudes that are yet to be taken by both.

The roots of this matter reach further back than it is the purpose here to probe. Freedom, in its relations to property, persons, principles, has been the grand central figure of the century, and its outgrowths are essential features of the pending conflict. Indeed it requires only ordinary scrutiny to trace, during the latter years of our political life, the lineaments of

a great historic revolution. The advance, from the day John Hampden tested the ship money levy, to the day Strafford's impeachment ended Star Chamber procedures, and further, to the day Charles Stuart's head rolling in the basket finished the business of divine right—the advance, I say, was not more signal than that which has taken place here touching liberties; first from resistance against territorial extensions of slavery, next to abolishing the institution in the nation's capital, and now to initiating policies of confiscation and emancipation in the States themselves. A simple contrast of public opinion concerning all the questions involved in this war a year ago, and the public acceptance in which these same points are now held, will afford sufficient evidence of the progress that has taken place. That that progress has come from the people, and been towards radical views of freedom, scarcely needs to be illustrated. The conviction that any infringement of individual liberty if permitted to organize and perpetuate itself in society, imperiled its existence by inciting a substitution of caste or class rule for the simple equity of republican government, from being a hesitant disputed dogma, has become an accepted national faith girt with armies and navies for its upholding. This is Transition, this is Progress, this is Revolution.

The national administration of the present is the representative of this new order, so far as that is developed. The rebellion is a resistance against the national thought as thus reflected, and a determination to break up the government rather than submit. With the former, freedom is the controlling spirit; with the latter, slavery dominates all things. In other words, it is but a repetition here of that struggle, that contortion, that inward wrestling which time out of mind has convulsed every nation that has achieved enlarged liberties.

Applying therefore, the formula of revolution to the solution of this crisis, it will lead us to some conclusions that are well worth considering, and to a generalization of the future not as yet sufficiently meditated by our people. Before doing so, however, it will be well to examine some of the antecedents of this conflict in which we find ourselves engaged.

WHAT HAS MADE SUCH A REBELLION POSSIBLE?

The question is often asked, what has made such a rebellion possible? All writers of newspapers have hitherto habitually boasted that our government, by its very nature, pliant to popular will, precluded the calamity of civil war. The ballot box was worshipped as peacemaker, and so ordinarily it fell out; but here now, at the very acme of votings and hustings and elections, it has failed—has in fact turned up exactly otherwise. Let us strive to comprehend this phenomenon.

In the absence of any alleged tyranny, the *animus* of a movement which has hurried half the States into rebellion must be sought in those conditions and conjunctions which give unity to the sentiment of revolt.

First, then, we see that the line which separates freedom and slavery is everywhere the boundary line of rebellion; for even those border States that have not formally seceded are only held quiet by martial law. No where, however, has free soil shown any affinity toward the uprising. Its treason cases have been altogether sporadic.

Second—We find within those limits of rebellion the slave system is everywhere appealed to as the sufficient bond of affiliation. The *common cause* is treated as a thing existing, recog-

nized, undeniable. Even those who hold for loyalty to the Government in doubtful sections, hasten to profess fidelity to the institution to assure their own safety if the revolt succeeds. Sympathizers in our midst, too, all predicate their feeling on the same ground.

Third—We perceive the result of the slave system in the outworking of half a century has been to create a social life reposing exclusively upon caste for its honors as well as its industries; to transform political methods so that only minorities can rule, supplanting republicanism by oligarchy, and to divide or sectionalize the evangelical churches, compelling each to interpolate its creed with the slave code as the price of tolerance. Thus in the relations of man to God, to government, to his fellow beings, it has consorted those communities where it obtains—in other words, the whole area of the rebellion—into conditions of direct antagonism to the greasy body of the people of the nation.

It is because of these things that such a rebellion has been possible; things that ballot-votin so far has had no tendency to dissipate; requiring rather, as it would seem, the fierce surger of revolution and radical reform to cure. And the same cause which places those communities in a relation of conjunction as to each other also impels them to regard citizens of the loyal States as to all intents *foreigners*. Hence the vindictiveness that has been displayed, as also the plausibility of that view whereby their leaders have taught them to regard this war as invasion.

The conditions that characterize the communities now resisting the National Government, and resisting it because hostile to the national thought, whilst they result directly from the slave system—indirectly are abuses sprung from the constitutional and political system which by fostering and encouraging slavery has permitted it to generate such a diseased state. Revolution in its march must attack these if true to itself, for until it does the solution will be no nearer than at the outset.

If this be a correct analysis of events heretofore, as well as of characteristics now existing, it will follow that so long as the slave system obtains, engendering its sectionalism, so long hostilities will remain embittered, and tranquillity be impossible, even in the event of a conquest by overwhelming armies. It cannot but be apparent to whosoever shall consider the *educating forces* which slavery must continue exerting as it has heretofore done, to make its communities diverse in all social aspects, abnormal in political relation, and isolated in their industrial attitude, from the residue of the United States that a mere conquest without an assimilation of institutions will neither restore the Union among the people of those sections, nor cause the authority of the Federal Government to be accepted in good part. This truth is so clear, that the only wonder is how any administration could pass through a year of fruitless conciliations without perceiving the repugnances unremoved and the very cause of them all untouched. In justice, therefore, to the revolted States which our arms propose to reduce into submission, we must also make those eliminations—necessary in order that they may develop into unity and community with ourselves. To conquer and then leave them with a social life, a political system, religious fanaticisms continuously engendering and always impelling them to collision and resistance, would be neither prudent nor humane. To make war against the logical results of slavery, and leave slavery to breed other logical results as cause of future conflict, would be nei-

ther wise nor well. We must not only put down the men in arms, but we must also destroy the influences actively generating the spirit of disunion. We must eradicate as we march that element which alone makes rebellion possible in the present, and which will make it chronic in the future, if suffered to remain. Conditions which develop loyal, cohering, harmonizing States, and those which breed diverging, inimical, antagonistic States, are before us in their results—the former come of freedom, the true basis of constitutionalism, the latter of slavery its exceptional abuse—and we have but to insist upon the former and abolish the latter to effect national assimilation. The French Revolution of 1789 accomplished itself by laying the axe to the root of the feudal system, which had grown the inequalities and social evils that set Frenchmen at war with each other, and threatened the dismemberment of a great nation; and so we, in republicizing the institutions of this people, and confirming our free government to future generations, must obliterate that slave system which has dismembered the States and marked out the lines of rebellion, and without abolishing which any transition in the slave sections from the old to the new is a moral and physical impossibility.

WHAT JUSTIFIES THIS WAR?

If I differ from those who assign purely technical breaches of constitutional law as the justification to the General Government for a subjugation of the seceding States, it is not that I value constitutional law less, but that I prize the moral attitude and responsibility of my country more.

The principle of self-government is as applicable to the South as to the North, to one State as another, and I should be loth to utter one word which might disparage that fundamental doctrine of political freedom. But the principle of self-government as conceded to others, is limited by the principle of self-preservation as related to ourselves. While it might be matter of grave doubt, therefore, whether the expenditure of so much blood and treasure could be justified before God and man for the mere enforcement of conformity to this or that governmental form, there can be no question of the rightfulness of suppressing by force and at every cost an armed principle of antagonism that seeks to erect itself within our limits—fatal to our government, our freedom and our future. Believers in the right of revolution cannot advocate the absolute rule of the strongest solely because the majority exists. We know there is no *divine right* in constitutions any more than in kingships, and that in resolving the grave problem of enforcement there must be higher and more vital reasons for resort to war—that last arbitrament of nations—than the preservation of the simple unities of the past. If it were otherwise, if the limits of a State were all sufficient for its maintenance intact at every cost, then in all the great crises of the world's history *Right* would rest with establishment in opposition to reform, with geography as against revolution. But it is not so: the general verdict of mankind has decided quite to the contrary, and the page that kindles the eye of youth and quickens the blood of age, is ever found reciting the story of progress, of change, of the rise of republics, of the remodelling of institutions. Self-preservation, however, intervenes as imperiously with nations as with individuals, and without question it is now such preservation against ages of strife resulting from slavery as a social principle, consolidated militarily on the

frontiers of freedom, that we each and all feel and know to be the true justification of our people, for purposing a forcible reduction of the seceded States.

The mind can scarce conceive the frightful succession of calamities that would result from such a proximity of hostile elements, if permitted to take the shape of separate nationalities, and strengthen for a conflict involving the empire of this continent. War would be an eruptive volcanic destruction, multiplying desolations beyond the recuperative powers of peace, and peace would be but the giant struggle to outreach in the number, magnitude and costliness of the preparations of war. And war would be the rule, peace the exception—hated intense, enveloping both as with a garment of fire. It is to take bond of the future against such a fate; to confirm our liberties tranquilly to our children; and to restore moral forces to their proper ascendancy in the councils of the nation not less than the minds of the people, that a million of men are now enrolled in the armies of the Republic. This is the argument and the only argument that will at last be plead before the bar of history in vindication of our refusal to recognize the right of the rebellion to self-government.

THE LIMITS OF THAT JUSTIFICATION.

But this argument does not stop here. In justifying a coercion it also imposes a duty. If it carries with it the destiny of a whole section, and legitimates the sacrifice of rebellion on the altar of self-preservation, it likewise sternly enjoins that the means used shall confront the inherent cause of the revolt, and that the end attained shall correspond with the basis on which alone the war can be justified. It necessitates, by its very logic, that hostilities shall adjust themselves to the higher reason that underlies the resort to force. Hence it follows that if we be honest in the prosecution of this war—if we intend it as a guarantee for the future, and not a mere spoliation of the present—if we seek an assimilation and confirmation of the Republic, and not a mere subjugation of adjacent provinces for Proconsular rule—if we are truly penetrated with a resolve to subdue that antagonism of a social and political state, resting on slavery, and threatening all free institutions, which constitutes the life of the rebellion—then does our very sincerity demand that we address ourselves at once to the work necessary to insure a future of peace, honor and safety, by proclaiming emancipation as the precursor of our armies. This is fundamentally a limitation upon the justice of this war; for if we shall fail to strike at that which we set forth as the substance of the peril that demands such terrible repression, then will this nation stand convicted before the world either as an imposter, or else an imbecile. Logically we may not halt between the extremes of a concession to the projected Southern slave Confederacy of the right to choose its forms of government and association, subject of course to the equities of separation, or else compelling those States into unity and submission upon grave policies of self-defense, we are bound in honor and truth to eradicate that element which creates our danger, and makes such a concession exceptional and inadmissible. I am aware that there are geographical reasons urged, such as the division of mountain and plain, the command of navigable streams, and control of inter-oceanic transit lines, in vindication of the war policy, and I fully admit their force and pertinency, simply remarking, however, that such reasons only go the propriety of exacting secu-

ities to commerce and intercourse—might be solved by a *Zoll-Verein* perhaps—and do not touch, as does the slave question, the vital principle of the very existence of our government. Let us then accept the limitation equally with the justification, and take that step forward demanded by the triumvirate of reason, justice, safety.

THE BARBARISM OF FORCE.

The lover of his country is not apt to be discouraged as to the eventual triumph of its arms. The lost battle, the miasmatic campaign, abandoned lines and blown up magazines are regarded as incidents of war. They are deplored but not held as conclusive, or even significant of the ending. There are "signs of the times," however, in our horizon that have a gloomier look than lost battles. And darkest and strangest of all the discouragements that have of late befallen, must be considered the spectacle presented by the Government in its dealings with this terrible crisis—*reposing itself altogether upon the mere barbarism of force*. One would think, when reading the call for six hundred thousand men to recruit our armies, and seeing here no appeal to or recognition of the ideas that rule this century, not less than this hour, that, as a Government ours was intent on suicide—as a nation we had abandoned our progression. Can it be that those who have been advanced for their wisdom and worth to such high places of rulership do not understand that since this world began the victories of mere brute force have been as inconsequent as the ravages of pestilence, and as evanescent as the generations of men. Or can it be that, understanding, they care only for tiding over the present contest to bequeath revolt and internecine war as the inheritance of those who are to come after them. That would be virtual disintegration—national death. If the Government undertakes to abandon the revolution in its very birth-pains—if it intends to have no reference to the ideas of which it is the representative—if it contemplates a disregard of the progressing thought that not only installed it, but has carried it so far forward since installation—if it is determined to found its dominion over subjugated States not in the name of a principle that shall assimilate its conquests and assure their liberties, but of simple power—then will it place itself, by its own action, in the attitude of other and equally gigantic powers that have attempted the same work and have failed. It may have its day of seeming successes, but even that will entail an age of complications. Does not Poland, as fully alive to-day, after ninety years of forcible suppression, as on that morning of the first partition, convince us that this thing of the dominion of power without the assimilation of nations can only continue upon condition of an ever-recurring application of those forces that achieved the first reduction? Does not the uprising and the cry for a united Italy, after five hundred years of fitful effort, continuous conflict, and successive disintegration under the tramp of a multitudinous soldiery, tell how fixed are social laws, how faithful to freedom are peoples, and how certain the retribution following upon those policies of government that sacrifice the future to the present, the moral to the mere material, the consolidating the foundations of a great commonwealth to the hollow conquest, the mock settlement, the outward uniformity. History is full of such illustrations, because history repeats itself. But I need not go with you further in citing its judgments in condemnation

of that reliance upon physical force which deems itself able to dispense with any appeal to principle. We cannot if we would cast behind us the experience of eighteen centuries of Christian amelioration, in which mankind have been learning to rely upon moral and intellectual forces rather than simple violence in their dealings with each other as nations. Not that civilization has surrendered its rights of war, but that it insists that ideas shall march at the head of armies. Napoleon III, when he announced that the French nation alone in Europe made war for an idea, intended to represent it as leading, not relapsing from the civilization of the age. And therein he both uttered a philosophic truth, and penetrated the secret of success. Strip the choicest legions of the inspiration they derive from a controlling, elevating cause—especially that cause whose magic watchword cheers to victory in every land—and in vain will you expect the heroic in action or the miracle in conquest. It is a coward thought that God is on the side of the strongest battalions. The battles that live in memory—that have seemed to turn the world's equanimity upside down, have been won by the few fighting for a principle as against the multitude enrolled in the name of power. When therefore it is conceded that the mere announcement of a policy of freedom as the policy of this war would paralyze the hostility of all the sovereigns of Europe and wed to us the encouragement of their peoples, why is it that so little faith obtains among our rulers that it would equally strengthen the Government here amid the millions of our own land? Have the populations of our States fallen so low—become so irresponsible to the watchwords of liberty that it is not fit to make such an appeal to them? Is there no significance in the fact that amid the five thousand stanzas that have vainly attempted to exalt the unities of the past into a nation's anthem—a song of war kindling the uncontrollable ardors of the soul—one alone, proscribed like the *Marseillaise*, has been adopted at the camp fire—

"John Brown's body lies a mouldering in the grave,
His soul is marching on."

Six hundred thousand soldiers summoned to the field, and for what? The nation asks of the President, *for what?* Is it that the Government may wring a submission from the possible exhaustion on the part of the seceding States, that shall be a postponement, not a settlement, of this great crisis, and that shall be unrelated to the causes that have produced it or the progression on our part that has put on the armor of revolution? If so, the Government will find when, perhaps, it is too late, that in addition to the rebellion, it will have to confront a public opinion that has no sympathies with reaction and that will withdraw, as unaided as it has heretofore given all its trust, from those in power. Or, is it that grounding this great struggle upon its true basis, upholding the national honor whilst battling for the national thought, our armies are to be marshaled under the flag of freedom, and the peace achieved is to be one that shall assure personal and political liberty to every dweller in the land? If that be so, let the fact be proclaimed, not hidden from the people, and there will need no call from President, no conscription from Congress to recruit the ranks of the soldiers of the Republic.

EMANCIPATION AS A WAR MEASURE.

The two great revolutions of modern time which mark the most signal advance in political freedom, that of England during the Common-

wealth and that of France in 1789 have this among many other striking features of similarity—that in each case a large part of the empire resisting the advent of free principles, took up arms against the government to contest the issue. In Vendee, as in Ireland, it became necessary to establish by force the supremacy of the new order. It was antagonism by the population of whole sections, and in both instances, courses of conciliation having proved worthless, a stern and vigorous policy of subjugation was required. That even the success which crowned such measures was only partial and transient, demanding a supplemental work of assimilation, is also well worthy of attention. But in subduing the resistance now presented, this nation has that to contend with, not less than that to assist it, which was not present in either of the parallels cited. I allude to slavery, the strength and the weakness of the South.

Look steadily at the prospect. Nine millions of people in all—five millions and a half of whites addressing themselves exclusively to warfare, sustained by three millions and a half of blacks drilled as slaves to the work of agriculture. Such are the official statistics of the seceding States.

With the whites the conscription for military purposes reaches to every man capable of bearing arms; with the blacks the conscription for labor recognizes neither weakness, nor age, nor sex. Solitary drivers ply the lash over the whole manual force to transform plantations into granaries. This allotment necessarily gives to war the largest possible number of soldiers, and extracts from labor the greatest possible production of food. Combined, protected, undisturbed, the relation so developed presents a front that may well shake our faith in any speedy subjugation.

Of these five and a half millions white population, the ratio over the age of twenty-one, which, according to statistical averages is *one in six*, will give a fraction over 900,000 men, from which deduct as exempt or incapables twenty per cent leaving 720,000, and add on the score of minor enlistments, one half those between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, or 55,000, and there exist 775,000, as the total possible Confederate force in the outset. If from this number 100,000 be stricken off as the aggregate of the killed, disabled, imprisoned and paroled since the outbreak of the war, and 70,000 be added as the probable number of recruits from Kentucky, Missouri and Maryland, there will result 745,000 as the effective force. From these are to be taken the men needed for the civil service, for Provost and Police duties, and for regulating the transmission or exchange of productions—certainly not less than 90,000, and there remains an aggregate of 655,000 as the fruit of thorough conscription. Perhaps however, it is right to make from such rigid possible military array, a deduction in favor of the population which abandoned the seceding States since the war began, and that which intrinsically loyal has evaded enrollment. In default of any certain information this may be placed at 55,000 men, thus leaving 600,000 soldiers fit for service and ready to be concentrated and marched as the skill of their commanders may determine.

Such is the strength of the array that now contests and resists the cause of advancing freedom in the nation. That the strength is not overestimated; that the conscription has been remorseless is proven by every critical battle field where our armies have been outnumbered,

and is to-day doubly attested by our beleaguered Capital, and widely menaced frontiers. There then is the rebellion stripped to the skin. Look at it squarely. Those 600,000 soldiers stand between us and any future of honor, liberty, or peace. How are they to be disposed of, defeated, suppressed?

It is an imposing column of attack, but it has also its element of weakness and dispersion. Remember that in making such an estimate, it has been predicated upon the fact that the whole available white population was devoted to the formation of armies. No part was assigned to the labor of the field or workshop, to production or manufacture; but all this vast organization reposes for sustenance—not to speak of efficiency, on the hard wrung toil of slaves. Reflect, furthermore, that this whole foundation is mined, eruptive, ready to shift the burden now resting on it so heavily. The three and a half millions of black population engaged in supplying the very necessities of life and movement to the Confederate armies are all loyal in their hearts to our cause, and require only the electric shock of proclaimed freedom to disrupt the relation that gives such erectness and impulsion to our adversaries, and such peril to ourselves. Years of bondage have only sharpened their sensibilities toward liberty, and the word spoken that causes such a hope will penetrate every quarter of the South most speedily and most surely. Emancipate the industry that upholds the war power of the South; destroy the repose of that system which has made possible a levy *en masse* of every white male able to bear arms; recall to the tillage of the field; to the care of the plantation; to the home supports of the community a corresponding number of the five and a half millions whites, and there will be put another face to this war. Compel the rebels to do their own work, hand for hand, planting, harvesting, victualing, transporting—to the full substitution of the three and a half millions blacks, now held for that purpose, and where now they advance with armies they will fall back with detachments; where abundance now reigns in their camps hunger will hurry them to other avocation. It needs only that the word be spoken. A national declaration of freedom can no more be hidden from the remotest sections of the slave States than the uprisen sun in a cloudless sky. The falsehoods, the doubts, the repulsions that have heretofore driven them from us, will give place to the kindling, mesmeric realization of protection and deliverance. In the very outset their forces, which now march to the attack, will be compelled to fall back upon the interior to maintain authority, and prevent escapades *en masse*. Insurrection will not so much be apprehended, for where armies are marshaled and surveillance withdrawn, the slave is wise enough to know that a plot with a center—an uprising would be sure to meet with annihilation, whilst desertion from the plantations is only checked by the repressive rules of our own lines. The right to do these things needs not to be argued; it is of the muniments of freedom, of the resorts of self-preservation, of the investiture that charges the government with the defense of the national life. And in this hour can be effected that which hereafter may not be practicable. Occupancy of the entire coast with many lodgments made by our navy, a penetration of the Valley of the Lower Mississippi, giving access to all its tributary streams, and the exposed front of Virginia, Tennessee and Arkansas, give ample basis for

extending such a proclamation. Resuming the advance ourselves, with augmented forces, we shall find the 600,000 Confederates compelled to detach one half their force for garrisoning the cotton States, whilst of the remaining 300,000, large numbers will necessarily fall out to replace the industrial support of their families along the border. State by State, as it is occupied and liberated, will recall for substitution those spared to offensive war in reliance upon slave production. The 300,000 will speedily become 100,000, and instead of concentrating back upon their reserves, massed in imposing column, as has heretofore been their policy when temporarily checked, *the very condition of the South will require a wide dispersion of their forces.* Conquest and suppression will thus be rendered matters of absolute certainty. The double result of immensely diminished numbers in the Confederate armies, and of its separation into broken columns for local surveillance over all threatened slave territory, is thus seen to flow from emancipation as a war measure.

AFRICAN BRIGADES.

In the grave contest on which we have entered for life and for death no appreciative judgment can be formed of the absolute necessity of writing freedom on the flag that leaves out of view the organization of the labor and the valor, for military purposes, of the population thereby liberated. The substitution of freed blacks, whenever they can relieve for other duties the enlisted soldier, has already so far commended itself, in defiance of slave codes and equality ears, as to have been adopted in some divisions of our armies. The wisdom that should have overseen in such a policy extended as far as practicable the addition to-day of 50,000 soldiers to the effective fighting force of the Government, perhaps changing the fate of critical campaigns, has been unfortunately wanting. And yet the army regulations as applied to be muster rolls of our forces will show that near twice that number of disciplined troops could have been relieved of ditching, teaming, serving or other occupation, and sent to the front. Moreover, any policy which looks distinctly to the subjugating and occupying, militarily, until the national authority shall be sufficiently respected to work through civil processes, the States now in rebellion, must embrace within its scope the employment of acclimated troops for garrison and other duties, during those seasons fatal to the health of our present levies. The diseases of a warm climate have already been far more destructive to the lives of our soldiers, as shown by aggregated hospital reports at Washington, than all our battle-fields, and hereafter, in the prevalence of those epidemics so common in the Gulf States, our battalions, if subjected to Southern service, would melt away disastrously. It is not possible, therefore, to separate the holding of the rebel States from the employ of acclimated troops. And for that purpose but one resource exists—the liberated blacks, whose veins course with the blood of the tropic. Arm them, drill them, discipline them, and of one fact we may be sure—they will not surrender. I take it that a race liberated by the operation of hostilities, is entitled, by every usage of warfare, to be armed in defence of those who liberated them, and furthermore, I take it that a people made free in accordance with the humanities of this century, is entitled by every right, human and divine, to be armed as an assurance of its own recovered freedom.

This step will be at once the guarantee against future attempt at re-enslavement, and the bond that no further revolt on the part of the States occupied shall be meditated. Above all else, it will be assurance unmistakable that no disgraceful peace, no dismembered country, no foresworn liberties will end this war. What, shall we stand halting before a sentimentality, blinking at shades of color, tracing genealogies up to sons of Noah, when our brothers in arms are being weighed in the scales of life and death! Go, ye men of little faith; resign your high charges, if it be you cannot face a coward clamor in the throes of a nation's great deliverance. Go and look tender upon the pale mother in the far Northland, weary with watching by her lonely hearth for the bright-faced boy's return. Her hope had nerved itself to trust his life to the chances of the battle field; but the trundling wheels bear back to her door a stricken form, in coarse pine box, with the dear name chalked straggling across, indorsed "Fever." Listen then to the wail of crushing woe sobbed out by a broken heart, and say to *her*, if you can, General, Statesman or President, that you refused the aid that would have saved that double life of mother and son. Verily, the graves of the Northmen have their equities equally with those of the rebellion.

COLONIZATION SCHEMES.

There are those, strange to say, who, in addition to the war now waged by us against five and a half million of whites, would add to the task of reduction thus imposed upon our government, the further work of taking possession of and deporting to other lands the three millions and a half of blacks. Disregarding the assistance that might be derived from the co-operation and enfranchisement of the slave labor of the seceding States, they would not only strip the slaves of the present uncertain hope of personal freedom which may be found within our lines, but, still viewing them as "chattels," to be dealt with as fancy may dictate, would serve a notice on the world that the best usage they can hope for from risking life to render us aid will be transportation to climes and countries beyond the reach of their knowledge, and that only inspire ignorance with terror. According to such, the practical solution of the present crisis consists:

First. In conquering the rebellion by making its cause a common cause, as against us, by both master and slave.

Second. In holding the conquered territory and and superinducing a state of peace, plenty and obedience by the deportation of all who are loyal and of all who labor.

With such the magnitude, not to say impracticability, of migrations that would require—even if all were favoring—transport fleets larger and costlier than those employed for the war, is not less scouted at as an obstacle, than the resistance to be foreseen from the unwilling and the depopulation that may be objected by the interested is treated as a fanaticism. Without challenging the sincerity of those who advocate such views, it will be sufficient to say that I differ from them altogether. I do not believe the Government has "chattel rights" in the slaves emancipated by act of war any more than the rebellion had; and I do believe that the doctrine of personal liberty, if it be worth anything—if it be not a sham and a delusion—if it is to have any application in this conflict—must be applied to them. It is not in behalf of the noble and the refined, the generous and the cultivated, that the evangels of freedom have

been heretofore borne by enthused armies in the deliverances history so much loves to delineate and extoll; but to the down-trodden—to the ignorant from servitude—to the enfeebled in spirit from long years of oppression. Why, then, shall those liberated in this country be bereft of the rights of domicil and employ? Because they are black, forsooth! That answer will scarcely stand scrutiny by the God who made us all. It would moreover justify slavery as fully as extradition. Deportation, if forcible, is in *principle* but a change of masters, and in *practice* will never solve the problem of the negro question as growing out of this war. If voluntary, it needs not to be discussed in advance of emancipation. The lot of the freed race will be to labor—in the future as in the past—but to labor for the wage and not for the lash. That there must be colonization as a resultant of the complete triumph of the national arms, and the complete restoration of the national authority, no one can reasonably doubt. But it will be a colonization of loyal men *into*, and not *out of*, the rebel States. The great forces of immigration, fostered, and directed, will work out the new destiny that awaits the seceded States—the assimilation that must precede a perfect union. What it has done for the Lake shore, for the Pacific coast, for the Center and the West, that will it do for the South also, when no blight of slavery lingers there to repel its coming or divert its industrial armies. And if in the development caused by its vast agencies, those natural affinities, so much insisted on by many, shall lead the African race toward the tropics, to plant there a new Carthage, it will be one of these dispensations of Providence that will meet with support and co-operation, not hinderance and antagonism from the friends of freedom on this continent.

THE UNION AS IT WAS.

The half-way house where halt the timid, the doubtful, the reactionary in this conflict, hangs out a sign: "The Union as it was." Within its enclosure will be found jostling side by side the good man who is afraid to think, the politician who has a record to preserve, the spy who needs a cloak to conceal him, and behind all these the fluctuating camp followers of the army of freedom. Not that there are no wise and brave men who phrase their speech by the attachments of the past; but that such have another and purer significance in their language than the received meaning of "the Union as it was." All who look at events which have come upon us see that "the Union as it was" contained the seeds of death—elements of aggression against liberty and reaction through civil war. Its very life-scenes, as time progressed, were ever and anon startled by the bodeful note of coming catastrophe, to be lulled again into false security by pæan songs to its excellence—like some old Greek tragically with its inexorable fate and its recurring chorus. And tragic enough it would seem has been its outcome to dissipate any illusion. Is it believed that the same causes would not produce the same results to the very ending of time? Is it wished to repeat the miserable years of truckling and subserviency on the part of the natural guardians of free institutions to the exaction, arrogance and dominion of the slave power through fear of breaking the thin ice of a hollow tranquility? Is it longed to undergo new experiences of Summer assaults, Kansas outrages, Pierce administrations, Buchanan profligacies, knaveries and treasons, with spirited interludes of negro catching at the North, and Abolition

hanging at the South? Is it desired to recall the time when the man of Massachusetts dared not name his residence to the people of Carolina; when free speech was a half forgotten legend in the slave States; when the breeding of human beings to sell into distant bondage was the occupation of many of the *elite* of the border land; and when demoralization, that came from sacrificing so much self respect to mere dread of any crisis or mere hope of political advancement, had dwarfed our statesmen, corrupted our journalism, and made office-holding disreputable as a vocation? For one, I take witness here before you all, that I want no such Union, and do not want it, because it contained that which made those things not only possible but probable. I trust that I value as much as another the purities of a Union, the excellencies of a Constitution, the veracities and accomplishments of a former generation, but who would be the blind worshiper of form rather than substance—of a name, rather than a reality—of a bond that did not bind, and a federation that has resulted only in disjunction? There are those I know who regard "the Union as it was" as a sentiment significant of material prosperity—unrelated to rights or wrongs, and as such they worship it, just as they would a State Bank corporation with large dividends, or any named machine that would enable them to buy cotton, sell goods, or trade negroes. But such should be content to pass their ignoble lives on the accumulation of other days, and not dare to dictate to others a return to such debasing thralldom. Of one thing they may be sure—that the great Democracy of this nation will insist that the Union of the future shall be predicated upon a principle uniting the social, moral, and political life of a progressive people—and purged of the poison of the past. When asked, therefore, as the champions of the hour often do ask, would you not wish the "Union as it was" restored, even if slavery were to remain intact and protected—say, emphatically, No! Say No! for such an admission would be a self-contradiction—a yielding of all the longings of the spirit to an empty husk whose only possible outcome we see to-day in the shape of civil war.

PRO-SLAVERY GENERALS.

It is, perhaps, the fate of all revolutions involving social changes, to be officered at the outset by the inherited reputations, great and small, of the foregoing time, and so far as this fate has fallen on our nation it is less to be wondered at than deplored. But soon there comes the time for change, when the Fairfaxes, the Dumouriers, the Arnolds must give place to soldiers of the faith. And hopeful to say, it has ever happened that conjointly with the public assumption of the principle of the revolution, mediocrity, routine, half-heartedness have passed from command, and victory has replaced disaster. So much is historic. We may take comfort then; for the uses of adversity are ours. Pro-slavery generals at the head of our armies are the result of pro-slavery influence in our national councils, and the hesitancy of the Government to proclaim officially any distinct policy of freedom has kept them there. By no possibility, however, can such, even if the chance victors of to-day, remain possessed of the future. I do not underrate the prestige of military success—but military prestige is as nought before the march of revolution; and it is only when revolutions are accomplished, that the reputations of great captains become great dangers. Pro-Slavery Generals, therefore, are only dangerous now from the disasters that accompany their admin-

istration. Their appreciation of the present being at fault, their methods, their reliance, their results will be inconsequent, and without force. Witness the miserable months of protracted negotiations, of harmless captures, of violated oaths making of border State imbecilities, of Order No. Three, of parading guerrillas, of halting advances and wasted opportunities. Could these things have been possible to commanders comprehending either the magnitude, the characteristics or the consequences of the war that slavery has inaugurated, and that must end in slavery extinction or the abandonment of our development as a free people? No man is so possible that the same series of incompetencies and sham-energies shall be prolonged indefinitely! No. It needs not that I should insist how surely all such must give way before the force of a public sentiment which, when once on the march, speedily refuses to trust war with responsibility who are not born of the age. It was just such a common thought of the Long Parliament that gave a "new model" to their army and a "self-denying ordinance" to themselves, extinguishing insincerity from the former and inspiring steadiness and self-sacrifice in the latter. It was a similar growth of public opinion in France that set the guillotine at work to keep account of lost battles with unsympathizing Generals. The pragmatic question then, of this crisis, is, how long, my countrymen, shall we wait for the "new model" and the "self-denying ordinance" and the swift punishment in this day of calamitous command and disgraceful surrenders.

THE PRESIDENT AS IMITATOR.

No one has ever read of a more touching spectacle in the life of nations, than that now presented by this people. Beyond any parallel in the most sublime of these things dear to its affection—a noble contest for traditionally sacred liberties. All its rights of person and of property have been yielded unannouncingly at the behest of the government, asking only in return a speedy victory, unceasing misgivings of the war upon a true principle to an honorable ending. The *liberty* never has been suspended not only in the revolted territory, but likewise in many of the loyal States. A censor system, limiting and embarrassing all travel and traffic, has been enforced with strictness. The ownership of the press not only forbids the transmission of news, but curtails even the expression of opinion within national boundaries undiminished. Arbitrary imprisonment by members of the cabinet, banishments summarily notified, emotions fanned at opposition fires, assessed by military commissions, made responsible indefinitely—in short, all the pathology of the most rigid European absolutism has been imported into our midst. It is not to complain that these things are refuted; for, if it is necessary, they will be, as they have been, abundantly refuted; but to show how unjust is the attitude of this nation and yet how brave. The President of the United States, to-day, holds a direct military power more untrammelled than ever in the world; and, in addition thereto, has created by the volunteer agencies of the people, a million of armed men, obedient to his command. Nay, and I say the President was chosen as a "strong man." In truth, I might say that his officials entrusted with administrative military instead of civil law—every agency I have named Marshal seems to be feeling his time to see if he too has not the warts of

the Great Protector. If this were the occasion for state banteries of the Constitution and the Union, it might well be asked just here, where in that much lauded parchment and league is the warrant for these things specifically? But I carp not at such technicalities. Give him rather more power if necessary—give him any trust and every appliance, only let it be not without avail. And yet with all this sacrifice, with all this effort, with quick response to every demand for men and money, what do we see? A beleaguered capital, only saved by abandoning a year of conquest and long lines of occupation; the confidence of the whole nation shaken to its very foundations by accumulated disasters and halting policies; and the grave inquiry, mooted in no whispered voice by men who have never known fear in any peril, can this country survive its rulers? I do not say the doubt is justified; but I do say that it exists in many minds that have been prone heretofore to confidence. We have seen fifty thousand soldiers, the *élite* of the nation, sacrificed, and six hundred millions of treasure, the coin wealth of the people, expended. We have reached the stage of assignments and conscriptions, and are now summing the militia of the loyal States to repel invasion. And can any one cognizant of our actual condition, and not misled by false bulletins, or varnished glories, stand forth and say, with truth and honor, we are any nearer a solution in this hour of the great crisis in which we are involved than we were a year ago? I challenge a response. Or will any delude you longer with the belief that a great victory will accomplish the ending? I do not believe it.

In the presence, therefore, of such thick coming danger, and having borne itself so continually and so well, has not this nation now the right to demand of President and of Cabinet, and of Generals, that there shall be an end of policies, that have only multiplied disasters and disrupted armies, and a substitution of other policies that shall recognize liberty as the corner stone of our Republic, and write Freedom on the flag.

In conclusion let me say, that the time has passed when such a demand could be denounced even by the most servile follower of administrations, as a fanaticism. For the chief of the Republic has himself recognized his right to do so, if the occasion shall require, in virtue of being charged with the preservation of the Government. He has furthermore become so far impressed with the urgency that manifests itself, that he has ordered immediate execution to be given to the act of the last Congress, prescribing a measure of confiscation and emancipation. This day, too, is the anniversary of its enforcement, as it is the anniversary of the adoption of the original Constitution of the United States. Let us, then, in parting, take hope from the cheerful coincidence. The act of Congress, if it is true, is but an initial measure, embarrassed by many clauses, and may be much limited by hostile interpretation. Still it can be made an avatar of liberty to thousands who shall invoke its protection, and the instrument of retributive punishment to those who have sought the destruction of all free government. And more than all else, its rigid enforcement and true interpretation will give earnest to the nation of that which must speedily ensue—direct and immediate emancipation by the military arm, as a measure of safety, a measure of justice, and a measure of peace.





